

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (Docket No. 2052)

| În re                 | the Application of:    | )                         |       |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
|                       | Mark Yarkosky          | )                         |       |
| Seria                 | l No. 10/659,647       | ) Examiner: O. Ajibade Al | konai |
| Filed                 | : September 10, 2003   | )                         |       |
| Confirmation No. 3662 |                        | ) Art Unit: 2617<br>)     |       |
| For:                  | METHOD FOR DYNAMICALLY | )                         |       |
|                       | DIRECTING A WIRELESS   | )                         |       |
|                       | REPEATER               | ,<br>)                    |       |

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

## **COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Dear Sir:

Applicant expresses appreciation for the Examiner's allowance of the present application.

Applicant understands that the Examiner has thoroughly examined the claims and prior art of record and has concluded that the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the entirety of each combination of functions recited by each of the allowed claims, that the Examiner has found each claim as a whole to patentably distinguish over the art of record, and that patentability of the claims does not rest on only those aspects that the Examiner listed in the reasons for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the reasons for allowance are clear from the record

of prosecution as a whole and, thus, that a separate statement of reasons for allowance is

unnecessary in this case.

In addition, Applicant notes that there are two typographical errors in the Examiner's

statement of reasons for allowance. On page 2, the Examiner indicated that claims 32-45 are

allowed. However, on page 3, the Examiner mentioned that "claims 33-36 are rejected based on

their being dependent on claim 32," while the context of the statement indicates that claims 33-

36 are allowed at least due to their being dependent on claim 32. Similarly, on page 4, the

Examiner mentioned that "claims 38-45 are rejected based on their being dependent on claim

37," while the context of the statement indicates that claims 38-45 are allowed at least due to

their being dependent on claim 37. Applicant understands that claims 32-45 are allowed as

indicated by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-6-08

Reg. No. 54,605

2



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (Docket No. 2052)

| RADE   | ,                      |       |                             |
|--------|------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| In re  | the Application of:    | )     |                             |
|        |                        | )     |                             |
|        | Mark Yarkosky          | · )   |                             |
|        |                        | )     |                             |
| Serial | No. 10/659,647         | )     | Examiner: O. Ajibade Akonai |
| Filed: | September 10, 2003     | )     |                             |
|        |                        | )     | Art Unit: 2617              |
| Confi  | rmation No. 3662       | )     |                             |
|        |                        | · ) · |                             |
| For:   | METHOD FOR DYNAMICALLY | )     |                             |
|        | DIRECTING A WIRELESS   | )     |                             |
|        | REPEATER               | )     |                             |

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

## COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Dear Sir:

Applicant expresses appreciation for the Examiner's allowance of the present application.

Applicant understands that the Examiner has thoroughly examined the claims and prior art of record and has concluded that the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the entirety of each combination of functions recited by each of the allowed claims, that the Examiner has found each claim as a whole to patentably distinguish over the art of record, and that patentability of the claims does not rest on only those aspects that the Examiner listed in the reasons for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the reasons for allowance are clear from the record

of prosecution as a whole and, thus, that a separate statement of reasons for allowance is

unnecessary in this case.

In addition, Applicant notes that there are two typographical errors in the Examiner's

statement of reasons for allowance. On page 2, the Examiner indicated that claims 32-45 are

allowed. However, on page 3, the Examiner mentioned that "claims 33-36 are rejected based on

their being dependent on claim 32," while the context of the statement indicates that claims 33-

36 are allowed at least due to their being dependent on claim 32. Similarly, on page 4, the

Examiner mentioned that "claims 38-45 are rejected based on their being dependent on claim

37," while the context of the statement indicates that claims 38-45 are allowed at least due to

their being dependent on claim 37. Applicant understands that claims 32-45 are allowed as

indicated by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-6-02

Rv

Melissa A. Jobe

Reg. No. 54,605

2